

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/797,515	Applicant(s) NAROFF ET AL.
	Examiner Phillip H. Nguyen	Art Unit 2191

All Participants:

- (1) Phillip H. Nguyen. (3) _____.
 (2) David Cochran (Reg. No. 46,632). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 October 2009**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes NoIf Yes, provide a brief description: *a proposed amendment and a new prior art.***Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

102

Claims discussed:

All independent claims

Prior art documents discussed:

*Szoke and Mulchandani (new prior art)***Part II.****SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:****Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: During the telephone interview with the undersigned attorney (David Cochran), examiner indicate the allowable subject matter and suggested an examiner's amendment to amend the independent claims to incorporate these features to overcome and clarify the claimed invention. Examiner also provided a new reference to further indicate that the limitations of the independent claims are also rejectable by this new reference. The proposed examiner's amendment and the new discovered prior art have been discussed with the undersigned attorney on 10/15/2009. The undersigned attorney indicated that he has to discuss this proposed amendment with the applicant. On 10/22/2009, the undersigned attorney, David Cochran indicated to the examiner that he still review the new reference and indicated that it is ok if the examiner issues an office action. Since, an agreement was not reached, a new rejection is issued.